

work both ways. Thank you.

SPEAKER NICHOL: We are now on the Kahle amendment. Senator Vickers, did you wish to speak to the Kahle amendment?

SENATOR VICKERS: Yes, Mr. President. Mr. President, and members, I understand the points that Senator Kahle is trying to bring forth. I recognize that perhaps the need in certain areas or from certain people's points of view but I am going to have to rise to oppose the Kahle amendment. I think this bill is a good bill. The concept is good but I quite frankly have a lot of problems with applying this concept to the incidental use of recharge from these projects. Now to let you know a little bit about where I am coming from, there is also a letter that Senator Kahle sent around signed by Elton Griffis. Elton Griffis happens to live in Cozad which is in the area that my father was from, grew up in, and on this letter it talks about several irrigation ditches, a 30 Mile Ditch, the Cozad Ditch, 6 Mile Ditch Company, and others. At one time I myself farmed under a farm that was under the 30 Mile Ditch. I also farmed some ground that was under the Tri-County system. I am familiar with that area to the extent that I recognize that there is a lot of recharge in that area, so much recharge, as a matter of fact, that they have drainage ditches throughout the area in order to keep the recharge coming to the top and having cattails start growing. I can remember the point in time when the Tri-County first went through when the cattails started growing and the alkali started showing up and landowners started going to Tri-County and said, "Hey, you are ruining my farm." And the Tri-County said, "No, we are not hurting your farm. That is not our water." Now what they are saying is, "Well, by golly, ya, now that we think about it, it is our water. Incidentally, that water is our water that has been charging this aquifer up to the point of oversaturation at times and now we might want to set up a procedure whereby we are going to charge you for it." I have a whole lot of problems with that. Maybe these farmers don't want that much water. Did anybody ever think that perhaps they didn't want the water up into their basements. Maybe they didn't want it up into their... ruining their soil. Maybe they wanted the aquifer down 20 feet instead of being in the top 5 foot. Now if that is the case, then to charge them to put that water up there I think is fundamentally wrong. The concept that we are going to recognize the beneficial use of surface water for ground water recharge is a very good one. That is the concept of 198. The concept that we can build projects into the future based on recovering some of the cost for ground water recharge is a very good one, but I think those